

REMARKS

In the May 1, 2007, Final Office Action (hereinafter "Office Action"), Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1, 8-10, 24, 27, 28, 36, 42, and 45-50 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,023,679, issued to Acebo et al. (hereinafter "Acebo et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,177,825, issued to Borders et al. (hereinafter "Borders et al."). Claims 2-7, 11-12, 34, 35, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0082877, to Schiff et al. (hereinafter "Schiff et al."). Claims 13, 29, and 43 are rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,640, issued to Goheen (hereinafter "Goheen"). Claims 14-17, 30-33, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. in view of Goheen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,706, issued to Patel (hereinafter "Patel"). Claims 18, 19, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. and further in view of Patel. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. in view of Patel and further in view of Schiff et al. Claims 37-41, 56-58, 60, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,926,203, issued to Sehr (hereinafter "Sehr"). Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. in view of Sehr and further in view of Patel. Claims 52, 53, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. in view of Patel in view of Goheen and further in view of Sehr.

This response amends Claims 1, 27, 42, and 50. Claims 2-24, 28-41, 43-49, and 51-61 are as previously presented. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Prior to discussing in detail what applicants believe that all of the claims in this application are allowable over the cited and applied references, brief summaries of the disclosed subject matter and of the cited and applied references are provided.

Summary of the Disclosed Subject Matter

The disclosed subject matter generally relates to a system, method and computer-readable medium for processing reservation requests. Specifically, the disclosed subject matter maps one or more reservation requests into three levels of detail. The first level of detail utilized to describe a reservation request is a reservation transaction record. Each reservation transaction record can be associated with one or more reservation requests. A second level of detail utilized to define a reservation request is a reservation items record. Each reservation items record corresponds to a reservation transaction record and defines one or more inventory items, in some instances including dates, that are associated with a particular reservation request. A third level of detail utilized to define a reservation request is one or more reservation inventory records. Each reservation inventory record corresponds to a reservation item record or at least two reservation item records and is associated with an instance of an inventory item associated with the reservation request. Thus, the disclosed subject matter processes reservation requests for one or more inventory items utilizing the three levels of detail.

Summary of Acebo et al.

Acebo is purportedly directed toward a method for automatically generating travel reservation information for at least one traveler. As taught in Acebo et al., a computer reservation system (CRS) receives traveler identification information from each traveler, where each traveler is located at one or more locally operated computer systems. (Acebo et al., Col. 4, lines 42-49.) A passenger name record (PNR) is created from the information. (Col. 4,

lines 54-56.) In conjunction, the CRS generates at least one potential travel itinerary for each traveler, at least one of which is subsequently selected and booked. (Col. 4, lines 56-58.) Information regarding the booked itinerary reservation is placed in the PNR. (Col. 4, lines 58-60.) The CRS creates an information management record (IMR) when the reservation is booked, including parsed information from the PNR. (Col. 5, lines 17-19; Col. 9, lines 45-47.) The IMR is then transferred to a locally operated computer system. (Col. 5, lines 20-21.)

In one aspect, Acebo et al. teaches a method for storing booked travel itinerary reservation information into two tables. The method includes the steps of accessing the booked travel itinerary information from the CRS. (Col. 6, lines 16-18.) All characteristics common to the travel transactions are stored into a common table on the locally operated computer system. (Col. 6, lines 17-21.) Additionally, information corresponding to uncommon characteristics, are stored in the locally operated computer system in detail tables. (Col. 6, lines 21-25.) A linking field associates the detail tables to the common table. (Col. 6, lines 25-26.) Thus, Acebo et al. teaches a traditional two tiered information management system.

Acebo et al. fails to teach generating three levels of detail defined by reservation transaction records, reservation items records, and reservation inventory records corresponding to matching inventory data. Additionally, Acebo et al. fails to teach reservation items records defining a second level of detail that identifies sets of inventory items associated with specific reservation requests. Further, Acebo et al. fails to teach or suggest associating at least two reservation item records with an instance of an inventory item. Still further, Acebo et al. fails to teach or suggest reservation items records including date information associated with the reservation items.

Summary of Borders et al.

Borders et al. is directed to a technique for effecting electronic commerce using a data network. Specifically, there is an inventory subsystem that includes an inventory database configured to maintain inventory records. When a customer wants to place an order, a

publishing system in Borders et al. manages the inventory in a tiered tree structure. For example, Borders et al. describes the system associating each inventory item with a SKU, regardless of whether the item is available for customer purchase, for example, a 16-ounce Brand X potato chips is an inventory item. (Borders et al., Col. 9, lines 25-27.) The next tree level is a grouping of inventory items called a product, for example, Brand X potato chips is a product. (Col. 9, lines 27-34.) The next and top level of the tree is called a category and includes groupings of products, for example, the product Brand X potato chips belongs to the category of potato chips. (Col. 9, lines 30-37.)

Despite disclosing a hierarchy structure for storing and managing inventory items, Borders et al. fails to disclose both inventory records referenced by at least two reservation item records, and reservation items components that define a second level of detail, including at least dates.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that "wherein one or more reservation inventory records define a second level of detail . . . is vague and indefinite. In response, applicants have modified the claim to read "wherein one or more reservation inventory records define a third level of detail" Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 particularly points out the claimed subject matter. Therefore, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection and allowance of Claim 1 in accordance with the following arguments and amendments is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Acebo et al., in View of Borders et al.

Claims 1 and 27.

The Office Action asserts that Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. teaches every element of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1 and 27 have been amended to include "one or more reservation inventory records . . . that corresponds to at least two instances of the reservation item records." It is respectfully submitted that neither Acebo et al., nor Borders et al., alone or in combination, specifically or implicitly recite that one or more reservation inventory records corresponds to at least two instances of the reservation items records. Applicants agree with the Office Action that Acebo et al. fails to teach "generating three levels of detail for the user request for reservation defined by reservation transaction records, reservation items records and reservation inventory records...." Acebo et al. is limited to teaching a two tier organizational system in which reservation instance information is broken into common data and uncommon data.

In a similar manner, Borders et al. does not teach or suggest a three-tiered information hierarchy in which the third tier of data that includes two or more instances of a reservation items records that modify the second tier of information reservation items. Borders et al. does not teach or suggest such a one to many distribution as recited in amended Claim 1.

Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. and allowance of Claims 1 and 27.

Claims 42 and 50

The Office Action asserts that Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. teaches every element of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 42 has been amended to include "the one or more reservation items components define a second level of detail, organized according to date information associated with the reservation items." In a similar manner, Claim 50 has been amended to include "the one or more reservation items components define a second level of detail, including date information associated with the reservation items." It is respectfully submitted that neither Acebo et al., nor Borders et al., alone or in combination, disclose explicitly or implicitly, a second level of detail that correspond to the reservation transaction records and that include date information. As stated in the Office Action and agreed by the applicants, Acebo et al. fails to teach or suggest a

three tiered information architecture. Acebo et al. is limited to teaching a two tiered information reservation processing system. Additionally, Borders et al. simply does not teach any reservation item information associated with date information. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al. and allowance of Claims 42 and 50.

Rejections Under All Other 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Cited References

Since neither Acebo et al., nor Borders et al. alone, or in combination, read on all elements of the independent Claims 1, 27, 42, or 50, and all other cited references fail to disclose the deficiencies of Acebo et al. and Borders et al., it is respectfully requested that all of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections for the pending claims be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing amendment and response is submitted as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed May 1, 2007. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please feel free to call applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

Maria L. Culicé Anderson
Reg. No. 40,574
on behalf of Mauricio

Mauricio A. Uribe

Registration No. 46,206

Direct Dial No. 206.695.1728

A. Uribe

MAU:tmn